

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF MINNESOTA

---

MATTHEW JOHN HULL,

Case No. 16-CV-3366 (JRT/LIB)

Plaintiff,

v.

REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

ST. CLOUD TIMES MEDIA; KMSP-TV  
FOX; and KSTP-TV ABC,

Defendants.

---

This matter comes before the undersigned United States Magistrate Judge upon the routine supervision of the cases that pend before the Court pursuant to a general assignment made in accordance with the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636.

Plaintiff Matthew John Hull commenced this action by filing a Complaint alleging he was defamed by the Defendants. Hull did not pay the required filing fee for this case, but instead filed an application seeking leave to proceed *in forma pauperis* (“IFP”). *See* Docket No. 2. In an Order dated October 25, 2016, this Court noted that Hull was a prisoner (and therefore subject to the Prison Litigation Reform Act) and calculated his initial partial filing fee to be \$1.24. *See* Docket No. 3 (citing 28 U.S.C. § 1915(b)). Hull was given 20 days to pay this initial partial filing fee, failing which it would be recommended that this action be dismissed without prejudice for failure to prosecute. *See* Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b).

That deadline has now passed, and Hull has not paid the required filing fee. Accordingly, this Court now recommends, in accordance with its prior Order, that this action be dismissed without prejudice under Rule 41(b) for failure to prosecute. *See Henderson v. Renaissance Grand Hotel*, 267 Fed. App’x 496, 497 (8th Cir. 2008) (per curiam) (“A district court has discretion to dismiss an

action under Rule 41(b) for a plaintiff's failure to prosecute, or to comply with the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure or any court order.”).

**RECOMMENDATION**

Based upon the foregoing, and on all of the files, records, and proceedings herein, **IT IS HEREBY RECOMMENDED** that this action be **DISMISSED WITHOUT PREJUDICE** under Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b) for failure to prosecute.

Dated: December 2, 2016

s/Leo I. Brisbois

Leo I. Brisbois

United States Magistrate Judge

**NOTICE**

**Filing Objections:** This Report and Recommendation is not an order or judgment of the District Court and is therefore not appealable directly to the Eighth Circuit Court of Appeals.

Under Local Rule 72.2(b)(1), “a party may file and serve specific written objections to a magistrate judge’s proposed finding and recommendations within 14 days after being served a copy” of the Report and Recommendation. A party may respond to those objections within 14 days after being served a copy of the objections. LR 72.2(b)(2). All objections and responses must comply with the word or line limits set forth in LR 72.2(c).

**Under Advisement Date:** This Report and Recommendation will be considered under advisement 14 days from the date of its filing. If timely objections are filed, this Report and Recommendation will be considered under advisement from the earlier of: (1) 14 days after the objections are filed; or (2) from the date a timely response is filed.